ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: 71045

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: JUMPERTZ
Serial No	: 10/738,464
Confirm. No	: 9590
Filed	: December 17, 2003
For	: DEVICE AND PROCESS...
Art Unit	: 2672
Examiner	: WANG, JIN CHENG
Dated	: June 6, 2006

Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPEAL BRIEF

(1) REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.

The real party in interest is Dräger Safety AG & Co. KGaA.

(2) RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.

There are believed to be no related appeals or interferences.

(3) STATUS OF CLAIMS.

Claims 1 through 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as obvious based on the teachings of Warner et al. (US patent 6,255, 650) in view of Ronzani et al. (US patent 6,421,031).

(4) STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.

No amendments after final rejection have been filed. A request for reconsideration dated December 8, 2005 was denied entry. It is not clear what the basis of this is (no reason to deny entry of the request for reconsideration has been given).

(5) SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

CLAIM 1:

The invention is a device for monitoring the deployment of respirator users. This is used for example by a rescue worker such as a firefighter that is wearing the respirator (paragraph 2) with the monitoring being by a mobile deployment center 17 (page 8, line 10). The device comprises an image recording means by which an image falling near or about the eyes of the device user can be recorded. This means (35 U.S.C.§ 112, ¶6) includes the function of image recording with this being from a viewing site associated with the user (an image

falling near or about the eyes of the device user can be recorded). The disclosed means is the infrared camera 2. The infrared camera is loctated on a helmet of the respirator user (page 7, line 2). A display 4 is provided as a mask display such as an LCD display 14 (page 7, lines 4-8). A signal processor means (35 U.S.C.§ 112, ¶6) has the function of evaluating the image signals recorded by the image recording means. The computer 5 contains a microprocessor 7, with which all computation operations and image processing are carried out (page 6, lines 14-17). An input means or medium is provided for receiving data including the data from the image recording means. The infrared camera 2, the microphone 3 and the mask display 4 are connected to a transceiver-receiver 12 located at the computer 5 for bidirectional data communication in a wireless manner by means of individual transceiver-receivers 9, 10, 11 (page 6, lines 17-19). A storage medium for storing building topography data is in the form of a plug-in storage module 6 (page 6, lines 13 - 14). A means (35 U.S.C.§ 112, ¶6) is provided for determining an instantaneous position of the device user by evaluating the image signals sent by said image recording means by pattern recognition of the image falling near or about the eyes of the device user and the stored building topography data. The means is the computer using a program module 8 for pattern recognition (page 6, lines 14 - 16). The computer evaluates the image signals and provides pattern recognition based on a comparison of stored topology and the image signal supplied by an image recording means (see e.g., paragraph 0007 and page 7, lines 14 -19).

CLAIMS 2-5

The input means may comprises an input medium including a bar code reader, a speech input device and a memory chip (paragraph 0017).

CLAIM 6

The display means may include an LCD display 14, wherein said display is arranged in the field of view of the device user within a gas mask (page 7, line 6).

CLAIM 7

The building topology data comprises fixed points including one or more of stairs, columns and window openings (page 7, lines 10 -13). Building topology is defined at paragraph 0008 as fixed points, e.g., support columns, door openings, window openings as well as stairs, which do not change even in case of a fire and thus are suitable for use as reference points.

CLAIM 8

The device may also include means (35 U.S.C.§ 112, ¶6) for transmitting the position data and image signals to a deployment center. The position data are transmitted to a mobile deployment center 17 together with the image signals via the transceiver-receivers 15, 1 (Page 8, lines 1 and 2).

CLAIM 9

The invention is also directed to a process for monitoring the deployment of a respirator user (paragraph 0014). The process comprises recording image signals with an image recording device (camera 2). The image corresponds substantially to an image falling on the eyes of the device user based on the camera being located on a helmet of a respirator user (page 7, line 3). The topology of a building, in which the user of the device is located, is stored in a storage medium (page 6, line 14). A computer 5 with pattern recognition software (page 6, line 14 - 17) determines the instantaneous position of the user of the device within the building by the evaluation of the image signals by means of pattern recognition by comparing patterns of said topography of the building with patterns of said recorded image signals for determining an instantaneous position of the device user.

CLAIM 10

An input medium may be used to call up the stored topology of the building from the storage medium wherein the entry position into the building is predetermined with said input medium. It is possible, for example, to store the building topology in the form of a bar code at the entrance or to retrieve a stored building topology based on a bar code at the entrance. The code can be read into the monitoring device with the reader before entering the building. As an alternative to a bar code, the building topology may also be stored in a transponder or to retrieve a stored building topology based on a signal from a transponder. The input medium may also be a speech input device in the form of a microphone. For example, it is possible with a microphone to state the exact position data, e.g., "fourth window on the third floor," on

entering the building. When the user of the device is then located within the building, the exact position can be determined with the image signal delivered by the image recording means and the pattern recognition (paragraphs 0009 - 0011).

CLAIM 11

The invention is also directed to a respirator user monitoring system. The system has features of the device (claim 1) including an image recording device connected to a respirator or to a user of the respirator for providing image signals (the infrared camera 2). A display 4 is provided (page 6, line 13). A signal processor is provided for evaluating the image signals recorded by said image recording device. An input means triggers the system for receiving data. This is described at paragraphs 0009 - 0011 as to starting the data input. A storage medium for storing building topography data. A storage medium for storing building topography data may be in the form of a plug-in storage module 6 (page 6, lines 13 - 14). A processor is claimed based on the function (35 U.S.C.§ 112, ¶6) of receiving building topography data via said input means and evaluating said recorded image signals by comparing patterns of said building topography data with patterns of said recorded image signals for determining an instantaneous position of the device user. The structure for this function is the computer 5 and the program module 8 for pattern recognition (page 6, lines 14 - 16).

CLAIMS 12-14

The input medium may comprise a bar code reader for one of providing data to said

processor and triggering access to data stored in said storage medium by said processor, a speech input device and a memory chip (paragraph 0017).

CLAIM 15 -16

The display means may include an LCD display 14, wherein the display is arranged in the field of view of the device user within a gas mask (page 7, line 6)

CLAIM 17

The building topology comprises fixed points including one or more of stairs, columns and window openings (page 7, lines 10 -13). Building topology is defined at paragraph 0008 as fixed points, e.g., support columns, door openings, window openings as well as stairs, which do not change even in case of a fire and thus are suitable for use as reference points.

CLAIM 18

The system may also include a transmission means for transmitting position data and image signals to a deployment center. This transmission means (35 U.S.C.§ 112, ¶6) includes the transceiver-receivers 15, 16 (page 8, lines 1 and 2). The system also includes the mobile deployment center 17 as a further element of the combination (page 8, lines 1 - 10).

(6) GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.

Claims 1 - 18 are rejected as unpatentatble under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) based on Warner et al. (U.S. 6,255,650) in view of Ronzani et al. (U.S. 6,421,031)

(7) ARGUMENT.

The rejection of claims 1 - 18 as unpatentatble under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) based on Warner et al. (U.S. 6,255,650) in view of Ronzani et al. (U.S. 6,421,031) is based on the position that the references together suggest the combination of features claimed. It is Appellant's position that the references do not teach each of the claimed features. It is further Appellant's position that there is no suggestion in the teachings of the prior art as a whole to provide the combination of features as claimed.

The Warner et al. reference is primarily involved in imaging (providing a display showing image information and providing high contrast visual image enhancement methods) based on a signal from an infrared camera. The purpose of this is to provide a firefighter or other person with information as to the temperature of various features. An important aspect of the imaging is to provide color coding which presents information to the user as to the various temperatures of items being encountered. For example, temperatures above 600° C (extremely hot for humans) are presented in shades of red with intermediate temperature ranges between 100° C and 600° C presented with shades of gray. Items below 100° C are presented

in shades of blue. This is discussed for example at column 8, lines 53-67. At column 9 (see for example lines 19-21) it is noted that the signal can be presented to another display monitor. Primarily, Warner et al. discloses receiving the IR image and presenting the display all in one single unit, for example for use by a firefighter.

The Ronzani et al. reference also presents teachings involving display systems. However, an important aspect of the Ronzani system (for example with reference to Figure 37) is the provision of a portable computer (a computer which moves with the portable display). A system is described which is particularly for firefighters wherein there is a head mounted fire fighting computer 710a as well as a storage module 714 that includes building schematics for the building where the fire fighter is located. A fire truck 77a may be equipped with a distributed data storage system 775a for storing maps and building schematics etc. In addition a communication modules may include a global positioning satellite sensor or other position sensor for accurately determining the position of the firefighter. This information is combined with the building schematics to provide the firefighter and the truck 77a with the firefighters' position with reference to the building.

These references together fail to provide any teaching or suggestion which would direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward the combination of features that is the invention. Ronzani presents interesting features using a display and using data and processing. However, the reference provides no teaching and no suggestion of using building topography data and received image data and evaluating this for determining an instantaneous position. It is important to note that in Ronzani et al. the GPS data provides the position information.

Ronzani et al. is not concerned with pattern recognition. Pattern recognition is not used to provide position information. The stored maps and schematics are used to show the position relative to the map or relative to the schematic. Although this may be a linkage between a GPS and a map this does not provide information as to the position of the respirator user based on pattern recognition. Further, this does not use Real Time data (the fire fighter's image data) and stored building topography data. With the invention, the position is determined by a comparison between the image data and the topography data with pattern recognition providing the location. Clearly Ronzani et al. directs a person of ordinary skill in the art to a very different approach. Specifically, GPS data is provided and this GPS data is applied to a map such that the GPS data is given context, namely the known location is linked to a map. How this is done is not explained. Ronzani et al. fails to teach and fails to suggest determining a location based on the use of image data and stored topography data with pattern recognition being the means by which the users attain the knowledge of the location.

The references employed in the rejection fail to teach the features of claim 1 including

> *"...means for determining an instantaneous position of the device user by evaluating the image signals sent by said image recording means by pattern recognition of the image falling near or about the eyes of the device user and the stored building topography data."*

Specifically, the secondary reference Ronzani et al. does not teach this. The Ronzani et al. reference must be considered for what it fairly teaches and giving the teachings their ordinary

meaning. Appellant will address each of the points raised by the Examiner in the final rejection as to the interpretation of the references. However, it is noted that there is no clear statement which supports the position that the Ronzani et al. reference discloses the feature of claim 1 reproduced above. The references cited in the rejection including Ronzani et al. clearly fail to teach features from claim 9 including the following:

> *"...determining the instantaneous position of the user of the device within the building by the evaluation of the image signals by means of pattern recognition by comparing patterns of said topography of the building with patterns of said recorded image signals for determining an instantaneous position of the device user."*

The prior art as a whole including the Ronzani et al. reference clearly fails to teach and clearly fails to suggest important features of claim 11. Particularly, the prior art at least fails to teach the feature of claim 11 as follows:

> *a processor receiving building topography data via said input means and evaluating said recorded image signals by comparing patterns of said building topography data with patterns of said recorded image signals for determining an instantaneous position of the device user.*

Considering again the Warner et al. reference, it must be kept in mind that Warner et al. directs a person of ordinary skill in the art toward improvements in the use of infrared

signals, particularly with regard to how the infrared data is displayed to the user. A primary aspect of the teachings relates to the presentation of information in the display of the features in the firefighters' environment. Pattern recognition is not important to these aspects of the Warner et al. disclosure. The infrared signal is presented to the user by coding the different temperature information to provide the user with a visual display of temperature information. This provides no suggestion with regard to using image information and using stored topography information to realize the location of the user based on pattern recognition. There is no suggestion to compare the real image signal with the stored topography data.

In the obviousness rejections of the first office action on the merits and the final rejection several portions of the reference were noted of interest. With regard to Warner et al., the following were highlighted as presenting a teaching affecting the patentability of the claims.

Reference was made to column 6, lines 39-47 with regard to receiving the IR signal and conditioning this or otherwise treating this. Column 6, lines 39-47 speaks of the physical positioning of various structures of the Warner et al. device. In this regard, Warner et al. is concerned with the ergonomics of the set up including weight and other issues for a firefighter or similar user. The cited section also deals with the mounting of sensitive equipment and the dissipation of heat from the various electronics. This does not present any teaching or suggestion of providing the structure as claimed and providing the process as claimed.

Column 8, lines 53-67 is referred to. This mentions the color coding, an important aspect of Warner et al.'s teachings. Warner et al. presents information to the person of

ordinary skill in the art with regard to receiving IR signals and how to present these to a user to pass on information readily. This presents no suggestion to provide the combination of features as claimed.

Columns 10 through 12 detail practical aspects of Warner et al.'s system using an IR camera unit and presenting a display. The display features do not deal with location of building topography features. Particularly the aspects regarding the display do not deal with pattern recognition based on stored topography information and the received real time image. Indeed, Warner et al. directs the person of ordinary skill in the art away from the invention and directs a person of ordinary skill in the art toward a very different problem, namely increasing the usefulness of an IR image signal via a display and coding of temperature information.

The rejection states that Warner et al. discloses storing image data relating to the building topography with zone identification as seen by the firefighter in a storage medium such as a memory buffer 22. Here reference is made to column 8, lines 53-67. However, this section discusses the particular ability to show low temperatures which could be for example human beings in shades of blue with the blue being associated with "safe" target temperatures. This discussion continues through line 67 which talks about alternatives to show target temperatures. There is no support in this section for the position that Warner et al. discloses anything with regard to data related to building topographies or use with this for pattern recognition in conjunction with image data. As such, it is absolutely correct that Warner et al. is silent with regard to the claim limitation of means for determining the instantaneous position. The teachings of Warner et al. are not about a means for determining the

instantaneous position. In fact there is no suggestion to use topography information for any instantaneous positioning considerations. Particularly, Appellant does not understand any reference to Warner et al. providing discussions of building topography in conjunction with issues presented in the present claims.

The rejection is clearly not supported by the references with regard to the statement that Ronzani et al. discloses the claim limitation of

> *"...means for determining an instantaneous position of the device user by evaluating the image signals sent by image recording means by pattern recognition."*

It is absolutely clear that Ronzani et al. provides instantaneous position information based on GPS alone. It is true that the information as to position (from GPS) is then used referencing stored maps and building schematics. However, this has nothing to do with pattern recognition and indeed does not specifically deal with any image signal evaluation for position determination. It is true that Ronzani et al. speaks of building maps and schematics whereby a user of the computer and display according to Ronzani et al. would be able to review such building information and schematics. It is true that GPS can provide information as to the position of a GPS sensor. However, there can be issues with regard to the operation of satellite elements within a building (in the center of a large building GPS may not properly present location information). As there is no discussion of establishing GPS locations on building schematics in advance, for correlation, it is not clear what is being discussed at column 18, lines 50-55. Ronzani at al. presents a discussion of the use of building schematics by a CPU

with GPS information to provide an exact position in the building. This may well suggest to the person of ordinary skill in the art of noting GPS locations on building schematics for a later correlation with actual GPS information. Although this is not stated, this may be a reasonable inference. What is missing from Ronzani et al. is a teaching to prepare those building schematics or maps in advance so that they have GPS information to later link the building schematics and maps to a real time GPS signal. This may be what is suggested but there is no clear teaching of any such link. Also, a link between real time GPS and a map with GPS locations is not what is being claimed. The GPS teachings present no information and no direction or teaching with regard to what is stated in the rejection (there is nothing with regard to determining position by evaluating signals sent by the image recording means by pattern recognition). It can be clearly stated that Ronzani et al. does not teach the feature for which it is cited. Further, at best, Ronzani et al. suggests establishing schematics of buildings and storing GPS information for later correlating real GPS information to the schematics. Although it can also be argued that this is not at all suggested (they simply disclose using GPS information) and then trying to correlate this with building schematics (e.g. trying to determine what floor a firefighter is on by elevation information and determine where in the building the firefighter is based on longitudinal and latitude information) the teaching certainly does not have anything to do with pattern recognition and real image to topography data correlation for determining a position of a user.

The Final Rejection includes several comments which are addressed below.

Page 2 of the Final Rejection in response to arguments, the features of claim 1 noted

above are referenced as disclosed by Ronzani. In support of this a reference is made to Figs. 1 - 2 and 37 - 38 as well as columns 18 - 19. However, Appellant can find no reference in any of the text or figures noted as to pattern recognition of the image near the eyes of the device user and the stored building topography data. In these sections of the Ronzani et al. reference which are referenced, there is no suggestion of these features. Further, the statement "... a personal firefighter in which GPS sensors along with the building schematics (i.e., the building map images) by the CPU to provide the firefighter and the truck with the firefighters' exact position in the building." does not make any sense. Of course building schematics are not building topography data as the schematics or scheme of a building typically is the floor plan. Building topography data is necessarily data as to the topography, wherein a pattern of the topography can be made to match a pattern of a recorded image in a pattern recognition analysis. A pattern detection system receives binary image data from the infrared camera, located on the helmet of a respirator user. In the computer (5) a partial-image recognition program recognizes a partial image that is contained in the binary image data. These partial images can be support columns, door and window openings or stairs. A further program module determines similarity between building topography reference images with known position information, which are stored in the computer, and the actual partial image. This comparison between measured and stored patterns is carried out with statistical methods. As such, the reference to the building schematics is not the claimed feature.

As noted above it appears that some correlation is to be made according to Ronzani et al. (although this is not explained) between GPS data and the schematics. For example, a

center point of each room or some other reference location can be matched in advance to GPS data for the location. In this situation the GPS data received from the firefighter on the scene can be matched to GPS data already correlated to the schematics. Although this is not explained, it is possible that a person of ordinary skill in the art would infer this. However, this provides no teaching and no suggestion with regard to the pattern recognition feature claimed in claim 1. Further, using a CPU which presumably receives GPS data and can presumably look up the GPS data for the exit and use the schematics to plot a path to the exit, again provides no teaching and no suggestion with regard to the claimed feature. If such look up occurs and the results are pictorially displayed, namely the schematics are shown with some type of directional information on the schematics pictorially displaying the direction of exit, this again provides no meaningful teaching or suggestion with regard to the claimed feature. It is not at all clear how this discussion is even relevant.

The discussion at the top of column 3 also does not appear to be pertinent to the rejection which is referenced. The Examiner's statement as to "it is well known" is not based on any information of record that supports the well known statement. Further, the statement does not provide any teaching or suggestion with regard to the claimed feature.

At page 3, the Examiner has the statement "Ronzani et al. discloses the recorded image data along the firefighters entrance paths and the image signal is captured by the GPS sensors...". However, it is not at all clear where this disclosure comes from. As noted, it is Appellant's position that Ronzani et al. presents suggestions with regard to predefining GPS locations on schematics and then receiving current GPS information to both provide an

indication of location as well as to plot an exit. Again this presents no suggestion or teaching as to the feature claimed. The statements that entrance and exit paths require evaluating a plurality of images in the building to be recorded and subsequently presented to the firefighter does not come from the Ronzani et al. text. A rejection cannot be based on a hypothetical modification of teachings of the references, particularly based on a hindsight consideration. There is no support for the position that a determination of exit paths requires the features as mentioned by the Examiner. If references teach such requirements, there should be a clear statement as to where these teachings come from.

The conclusion therefore, Ronzani teaches a pattern recognition of images along the firefighters' entrance or exit path is not at all a logical conclusion from the statements made previously at pages 2 and 3. There is no support for this statement. As Appellant noted, if the statements of Ronzani have any meaning, it is with regard to providing GPS information on stored schematics (floor plans) and using these to identify the location of a firefighter as well as an exit based on current GPS information from the firefighter. All of this involves no pattern recognition whatsoever.

At the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4, the Final Rejection presents a discussion of another embodiment according to Ronzani et al. (column 19) wherein an image display device allows a user to view displayed information. In the discussion, it is mentioned that information (image signals) can be sent to the Police Station for verification etc. It is stated that this is a pattern recognition of driver licenses and image data stored in the Police Station. Of course such is not the feature claimed and clearly the reference does not suggest the feature claimed.

Further, an optical reader (such as a bar code reader) reads markings and converts these to a digital signal representing digits such as alphanumeric characters. In this case, there is no pattern recognition but instead a particular bar is converted to a particular character and there is a subsequent correlation of this with a database. In any event, there is no pattern recognition as per the feature of claim 1 discussed above and mentioned at page 2 of the Office Action. The conclusion "the exact position the Police Officer is determined from GPS data along with the buildings schematics and city maps and thus the exact position of the Police Officer is determined by pattern recognition of the stored buildings schematics" does not make any sense. It is not at all clear how this is a logical conclusion based on the teachings of Ronzani et al. There is no support for the position that Ronzani et al. teaches evaluating image signals by pattern recognition and there is no support for the position that Ronzani et al. teaches evaluating GPS signals by pattern recognition. The conclusion is simply incorrect.

There is further no support for the position that it would be obvious to incorporate Ronzani's GPS sensors and CPU into Warner's device. Of course such incorporation would still not lead to the combination of features as claimed in claim 1 and would not lead to the features as claimed in the other independent claims. Even if the references suggest providing communication between a central deployment station and the firefighter or other like communication, the references do not suggest the features as outlined above.

Appellant further disagrees with the conclusion at page 5 that one of ordinary skill in the art is motivated to determine an exact position and figure out dangerous zones that a firefighter should avoid. Although this conclusion could be reasonable, rejections and

evaluations of the prior art must be made with reference to the teachings of the references and not hypothetical modifications or conclusions which are based on the benefit of Appellant's disclosure. Even if one evaluated hot locations based on the infrared data using the teachings from Warner et al. and one figured out an exit path based on predefined GPS locations on a schematic and provided an exit path for a firefighter, these teachings do not lead to the features of the respective independent claims noted above.

Appellant asks that the decision rejecting the claims be reversed and be set aside as the prior art as a whole fails to suggest features from each of the independent claims. Absent teachings and suggestions in the prior art to direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward the combination claimed, the rejection should be considered untenable and the claims should be considered patentable as presented.

Respectfully submitted
for Appellant,

By:_____
John James McGlew
Registration No. 31,903
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

JJM:jj/
71045-17

DATED: June 6, 2006
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-0827
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.

8) CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A device for monitoring the deployment of respirator users, the device comprising:

an image recording means by which an image falling near or about the eyes of the device user can be recorded;

a display;

a signal processor for evaluating the image signals recorded by said image recording means;

an input means for receiving data;

a storage medium for storing building topography data;

means for determining an instantaneous position of the device user by evaluating the image signals sent by said image recording means by pattern recognition of the image falling near or about the eyes of the device user and the stored building topography data.

2. A device in accordance with claim 1, wherein said input means comprises an input medium including a bar code reader.

3. A device in accordance with claim 1, wherein said input means comprises an input medium including a speech input device.

4. A device in accordance with claim 1, wherein said input means comprises an input medium including a memory chip.

5. A device in accordance with claim 1, wherein a LCD display is provided for providing an output of image signals via said display means.

6. A device in accordance with claim 1, wherein said display is arranged in the field of view of the device user within a gas mask.

7. A device in accordance with claim 1, wherein the building topology data comprises fixed points including one or more of stairs, columns and window openings.

8. A device in accordance with claim 1, further comprising means for transmitting the position data and image signals to a deployment center.

9. A process for monitoring the deployment of respirator users, the process comprising the steps of:

recording of image signals with an image recording device, the image corresponding substantially to an image falling on the eyes of the device user;

storing the topology of a building, in which the user of the device is located, in a storage medium; and

determining the instantaneous position of the user of the device within the building by the evaluation of the image signals by means of pattern recognition by comparing patterns of said topography of the building with patterns of said recorded image signals for determining

an instantaneous position of the device user.

10. A process in accordance with claim 9, further comprising using an input medium to call up the stored topology of the building from the storage medium wherein the entry position into the building is predetermined with said input medium.

11. A respirator user monitoring system comprising:

an image recording device connected to a respirator or to a user of the respirator for providing image signals;

a display;

a signal processor for evaluating the image signals recorded by said image recording device;

an input means for triggering the system for receiving data;

a storage medium for storing building topography data;

a processor receiving building topography data via said input means and evaluating said recorded image signals by comparing patterns of said building topography data with patterns of said recorded image signals for determining an instantaneous position of the device user.

12. A system in accordance with claim 11, wherein said input means comprises a bar code reader for one of providing data to said processor and triggering access to data stored in said storage medium by said processor.

13. A system in accordance with claim 11, wherein the input means comprises a speech input device for one of providing data to said processor and triggering access to data stored in said storage medium by said processor.

14. A system in accordance with claim 11, wherein the input means comprises a memory chip for one of providing data to said processor and triggering access to data stored in said storage medium by said processor.

15. A system in accordance with claim 11, wherein a LCD display is provided for providing an output of image signals via said display means.

16. A system in accordance with claim 11, wherein said display means is arranged in the field of view of the display user within a gas mask.

17. A system in accordance with claim 11, wherein the building topology comprises fixed points including one or more of stairs, columns and window openings.

18. A system in accordance with claim 11, further comprising a transmission means for transmitting position data and image signals to a deployment center.

(9) Evidence appendix

NONE

(10) Related proceedings appendix (new)

NONE